

PATENT APPLICATION
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q78953

Atsushi NARUSAWA

Appln. No.: 10/733,810

Group Art Unit: 2178

Confirmation No.: 8813

Examiner: David FABER

Filed: December 12, 2003

For: METHOD FOR CONTROLLING IMAGE FORMATION AND IMAGE FORMATION
METHOD

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the interview conducted on

August 10, 2007:

REMARKS

The undersigned Applicant's representative conducted an interview with Assistant Examiner David Faber on August 10, 2007 and a follow up on Aug 16, 2007.

During the interview, the following was discussed:

Brief description of exhibits or demonstration: None

1. Identification of claims discussed: 1-6, 14, and 15
2. Identification of art discussed: Templeman US Patent No. 5,845,303 and Nguyen et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,377,354.
3. Identification of principal proposed amendments:

As per claim 14 and 15, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph was discussed.

As per Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6, the phrase “can cause a conflict”, and “can impede initiating processing” were discussed. The Examiner indicated that the word “can” causes the claims to be ambiguous and should be amended to correct this problem.

As per claims 1 and 2, amendment was proposed to indicate that “judging” and “performing control” are conducted for each document.

4. Brief Identification of principal arguments:

Regarding the 112, first paragraph rejection, Applicant representative directed the attention of the Examiner to fig 1 and page 8 of the specification, lines 12-25. The Examiner indicated that he will reconsider this rejection upon the filing a response.

Regarding, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection, Applicant representative explained to the Examiner that the word “can” in the claim seem clear and should not be rejected as ambiguous. The Examiner disagreed and suggested that the claim are amended to more positive recites the limitations the Applicant intends as the invention.

As per the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Templeman. Applicant representative presented arguments that Templeman does not anticipate the claimed invention. In particular, it was argued that Templeman fails to teach “performing control, when said tags are judged to be comprised, such that processing to form images is executed after completing processing to determine coordinate positions; performing control, when said tags are judged not to be comprised, such that processing to form images is initiated before processing to determine coordinate positions is completed.” Also, it was argued that in Templeman when there no

conflict, an image is formed in the frame (i.e., the position for the image formation is preset), while, in the application, when it is judged that there is no conflict, images are formed in ascending order in the downward direction; meaning that the position for image formation is not preset and determined when the relevant image is formed).

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Nguyen in view W3School "HTML Tutorial: Welcome to HTML School." The Applicant representative Nguyen, similar to Templeman, also fails to "performing control, when said tags are judged to be comprised, such that processing to form images is executed after completing processing to determine coordinate positions; performing control, when said tags are judged not to be comprised, such that processing to form images is initiated before processing to determine coordinate positions is completed." In addition, Applicant representative proposed to amend the claims to indicate the "judging" and "performing control" are conducted for each document. The Examiner indicated that he will reconsider the rejection upon the filing of a formal response to the Final Office Action.

5. Indication of other pertinent matters discussed: None

6. Results of Interview: No agreement was reached. Applicant will submit amendment and arguments for the Examiner's reconsideration.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.


It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
U.S. Application No.: 10/733,810

Attorney Docket No.: Q78953

maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,


Albert DeCady
Registration No. 60658

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 16, 2007